General Assembly

Distr.: General
16 November 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-second session
21 January-1 February 2019

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on New Zealand*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 40 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. The New Zealand Human Rights Commission (NZHRC) stated that this UPR cycle fell within the beginning stages of an extensive reform agenda introduced by the new Labour-led Government elected in October 2017.[2] Despite some progress, significant human rights challenges remained and, in particular, entrenched socio-economic inequalities were proving difficult to address.[3]

3. NZHRC indicated that New Zealand did not have a written constitution and its charter of human rights was set out in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (BORA), an ordinary statute that could be repealed by a simple parliamentary majority.[4]

4. The Human Rights Act 1993 (HRA) established the role and functions of the New Zealand Human Rights Commission and the country's anti-discrimination legal framework, including the functions and procedure of the Human Rights Review Tribunal (HRRT).[5]

5. The 2013 Constitutional Advisory Panel, the Commission and the last UPR had issued recommendations that the BORA be amended to include the right to privacy, property rights, and economic, social and cultural rights.[6]

6. Following a landmark court case, the Cabinet had agreed in principle to allow the Courts to make a declaration of inconsistency if they believed that legislation was inconsistent with the BORA.[7]

7. There was considerable concern regarding the delay of proceedings in the HRRT due to, inter alia, its growing workload and limited resources.[8]

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

8. Despite its constitutional importance, the Government had yet to take concrete steps to consider the Treaty of Waitangi's (the Treaty), place in New Zealand's unwritten constitution, despite recommendations to do so in the 2013 Constitutional Advisory Panel Report.[9]

9. While the Government had officially endorsed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), a plan of action for its implementation had not yet been developed, despite international commitments to do so.[10]

10. Successive governments had acknowledged that Crown breaches of the Treaty caused Māori to suffer social, cultural and economic losses leading to wide social and economic disparities.[11] Pasifika people experienced similar levels of socio-economic disparity and disadvantage and had the lowest rates of median income, and high rates of exclusion from employment, education or training.[12]

11. Concerning accepted recommendations to combat domestic violence,[13] including the development of a national strategy,[14] NZHRC indicated that though the Government had embarked on considerable work to combat violence and abuse against women, a national strategy had not yet been developed.[15]

12. Concerning an accepted recommendation to eliminate the gender pay gap and increase women's participation in governance[16], while noting action taken and progress achieved, NZHRC remained concerned that women were still significantly under-represented in senior leadership positions in the public sector and in private businesses, with most businesses having no women in senior roles at all.[17]

13. NZHRC noted that women did not have the right to an abortion on request and that every abortion procedure must be authorised by two separate certifying medical consultants to confirm that the Crimes Act requirements had been met. The Government had proposed changing this approach and had requested that the Law Commission review the current legislation.[18]

14. Concerning accepted recommendations on child poverty[19] the Commission noted that the number of children who experienced poverty and material deprivation remained stubbornly high. It welcomed the new Government's designation of child poverty as a policy priority, including its introduction of the Child Poverty Reduction Bill.[20]

15. While noting initiatives by the Office of Disability Issues, the Commission indicated that the legislative framework did not consistently reflect obligations under CRPD. For example, family violence legislation failed to adequately protect disabled people experiencing abuse in all home-care/live in support situations.[21]

16. NZHRC remained concerned at outcomes arising from the minimum wage exemption system that could be applied to workers who were significantly and demonstrably limited by a disability. In 2016, the Government had begun work on reform, under the Disability Action Plan, to review this wage exemption but it appeared that this work had stalled.[22]

17. NZHRC also noted that the Human Rights Act did not explicitly include "gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics" under its definition of "sex discrimination."[23]

18. NZHRC was concerned that the Immigration Act prevented the Human Rights Commission from receiving complaints about immigration decisions.[24] While noting that the Government had increased both its refugee quota commitments and funding of refugee services in recent years, it was also concerned with the difficulties asylum claimants had in accessing social services.[25]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[26] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[27]

19. Several submissions encouraged New Zealand to become a party to ICRMW; ICPPED; OP-ICESCR and OP-CRC; ILO Convention on Freedom of Association and

Protection of the Right to Organise, 1948 (No.87); the ILO Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138)[28], and the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169); and withdraw its reservations to Article 8 of the ICCPR and Article 22 of the ICESCR[29]; and consider withdrawing its reservation to CRC relating to minimum age for entering employment.[30]

20. ICAN recommended that New Zealand ratify Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons as a matter of international urgency.[31]

B. National human rights framework[32]

21. JS13 noted that New Zealand had not yet formally incorporated all economic, social and cultural rights into its domestic legal framework, arguing that these rights were already protected by individual statutes.[33]

22. JS13 noted that Parliament had at times exercised its supremacy to override the BORA, contrary to its international obligations and stated that the BORA should be granted supreme status to over-ride rights-infringing legislation.[34]

23. NZLS stated that in the absence of a supreme bill of rights, it was critical that legislation be subjected to systematic and comprehensive rights scrutiny to forestall breaches of domestic and international human rights standards.[35] The section 7 reporting mechanism requiring the Attorney-General to report to Parliament on any draft legislation that appeared inconsistent with BORA was critical.[36] It was therefore a matter of concern when Parliament enacted legislation despite a negative section 7 report.[37]

24. AirTrust indicated that New Zealand's ability to protect the human rights of Maori was seriously hampered by its constitutional and legislative framework. There was little protection from violations of the Treaty of Waitangi and human rights arising from Acts of Parliament, and government policy and practice.[38] JS13 recalled that New Zealand has received several recommendations to strengthen the constitutional status of the Treaty and recommended that the country review and, where appropriate, implement the recommendations of the Constitutional Review and provide for appropriate constitutional or legislative recognition be given to the Treaty of Waitangi/Te Tiriti o Waitangi.[39]

25. JS13 noted that the Human Rights Review Tribunal was confronted with, among others, a large increase in workload and faced huge delays. It recommended adequately funding the Tribunal to ensure that claims are determined expeditiously.[40]

26. JS14 stated that the National Preventive Mechanisms had not consistently received adequate resources to carry out their OPCAT functions[41] and recommended that the Government increase funding levels to cover the actual costs of the Mechanisms' OPCAT work.[42]

27. CGNK raised the issue of participation of other political entities in the universal periodic review.[43]

28. AI stated that the Government had worked with the Human Rights Commission and civil society to develop the National Plan of Action for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights. AI indicated that the online tool developed under the Plan had improved the level of transparency to measure levels of progress on UPR recommendations.[44] JS13 stated that the Action Plan had not been adopted by the Government and was not, therefore, a National Plan, and was in reality a monitoring mechanism.[45]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[46]

29. JS9 indicated that New Zealand should ensure that anti-discrimination legislation included provisions to allow complaints about lack of services being provided to a particular section of the population.[47]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[48]

30. EC reported on recovery efforts from the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence. EC stated that one of the most serious long-term problems in Christchurch after the earthquakes was land damage[49] and indicated that the Government needed to properly identify and remediate earthquake-induced land damage, or compensate people in a programme of managed retreat.[50]

Human rights and counter-terrorism[51]

31. JS13 recommended that New Zealand: clarify the definition of "terrorist" and repeal section 22 of the Terrorism Suppression Act to ensure that those designated as "terrorists" were able to have that designation reviewed fully by the Courts.[52]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[53]

32. AI indicated that a 2016 report found a high use of seclusion and restraint in various forms, including solitary confinement, across correction and health facilities. The report showed that ethnic minority groups, in particular Māori, were over-represented in seclusion and segregation units.[54] JS14 was concerned, that less restrictive measures were not always explored and that such measures were not always used for the shortest time possible.[55]

33. Chief Ombudsman reported that there had been an increasing trend in the incidence of serious violence perpetrated by prisoners against both staff and other prisoners.[56]

34. JS14 highlighted the increase in the prison population noting that in 2006 New Zealand's prison population was 7,595 and that towards the end of 2016 the prison population reached 10,000 for the first time, an increase of approximately a third. This increase was impacting prison conditions.[57] CL stated that the prison population was increasing at a time when crime rates were decreasing.[58]

35. Chief Ombudsman reported that inspectors had found that remand prisoners were often detained in unsuitable conditions.[59] They had also observed prisoners being detained for unacceptable periods of time in police cells and remand centres attached to Police stations.[60]

36. AI recommended that New Zealand assess the impact of the growth of the prison population, particularly the remand population, on the human rights of people in detention, in line with SDG Indicator 16.3.2.[61] JS14 recommended the adoption of urgent, adequately resourced measures to sustainably reduce the prison population, particularly for remand and women prisoners.[62]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[63]

37. CL stated that legal aid was hard to access and that even when persons qualified for legal aid, this was granted as a loan to be repaid.[64]

38. DPA stated that there was a great need for accessible legal advice and advocacy to support disabled New Zealanders noting that the country had one dedicated disability legal service to offer support to the community on a national scale.[65]

39. JS5 was concerned that unconscious bias and institutional sexism disadvantaged women in the Family Court and that fathers' access to children was being prioritised over women's legitimate concerns for safety in cases of conflict and domestic violence.[66] JS4 stated that the family court has been accused of gender bias against both men and women.[67] JS6 recommended that New Zealand Government ask the Governor General to urgently establish a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Family Court.[68]

40. About seven submissions raised concern regarding the over-representation of Māori in the criminal justice system.[69] AI acknowledged the implementation of initiatives seeking to take a preventative approach. However little progress had been made since the last review. Māori remained alarmingly over-represented at all stages of the criminal justice system and this over-representation was particularly stark in the youth justice system.

While the number of youth charged in all the other ethnic groups had decreased, the number of Māori youth charged in 2017 remained similar to the number in 2014.[70]

41. AirTrust stated that Māori women made up 61% of women in prison, and that the numbers of women that were being incarcerated was increasing.[71] JS5 raised similar concerns.[72]

42. JS13 recommended stepping up efforts, in consultation with Māori communities, to address and prevent discrimination against members of the Māori communities in the criminal justice system.[73] JS14 recommended that detaining agencies develop overarching frameworks and strategies to address the needs of Māori in detention, in consultation with Māori and provide adequate resources to implement them.[74] JCNZ recommended adopting legislation requiring that Maori have access to culturally appropriate rehabilitation at all stages of the criminal justice system.[75]

43. AI welcomed the fact that since the last review, New Zealand had raised the age that a juvenile was tried within the adult criminal justice system to 18, including 17 year olds in its youth justice system.[76] JS15 stated that, however, significant problems remained. The age of criminal responsibility (ten years) was low, and for serious crimes such as murder and manslaughter, children as young as ten could face a High Court jury trial and an adult sentence.[77]

44. Four submissions raised concerns regarding young people being held in police cells.[78] JS14 noted that young people (aged under 18 years) were held with adults in detention facilities noting that New Zealand maintained reservations to the relevant international treaties in this regard.[79] Additionally, prison youth units were not restricted to offenders under 18 and some units contained young adult male prisoners aged 18 and 19. Some young men aged 16 to 17 had been held in adult prison units.[80]

45. AI recommended that New Zealand abolish the option in legislation to detain juveniles in police cells with other adults and ensure that the practice was eradicated. 81JS15 recommended that New Zealand address discrepancies in the age of criminal responsibility and sentencing provisions for children charged with serious crimes such as murder or manslaughter.[82]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[83]

46. Regarding religious instruction in state primary schools, NZARH noted complaints of discrimination in state schools against children and parents who opted out of religious instruction.84JS2 stated that state schools operated single faith religious instruction without Ministry of Education oversight, or guidelines.[85]

47. JS13 stated that the Government had introduced legislation in 2010 to prohibit prisoners from voting in elections regardless of the seriousness of their offences and recommended that New Zealand amend the law to ensure that restrictions on prisoners' right to vote are reasonable and proportionate.[86]

Right to privacy and family life[87]

48. PI reported that in 2017, New Zealand consolidated four statutes into the Intelligence and Security Act 2017, establishing an overarching authorisation and oversight regime for surveillance activities by its three intelligence agencies.88 The new Act set lower standards for non-New Zealanders, in particular relating to the obtaining an "intelligence warrant" and did not involve a judicial authority.[89] AccessNow noted that, inter alia, the new Security Act allowed for "purpose-based" warrants that would not need to be tied to any particular person or organization, which would fail to meet a standard of clarity and precision sufficient to ensure that individuals can foresee its application.[90]

49. PI indicated that New Zealand was openly part of the "Five Eyes" signals intelligence-sharing alliance and stated that there was an inability to control how information that was shared was used.[91] AccessNow raised similar concerns.[92]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[93]

50. JS17 stated that since its last review, New Zealand had made regressive policy moves. The Employment Relations Amendment Act 2014 breached ILO Convention 98, including by the effective removal of the right to strike in support of multi-employer bargaining; and by placing unnecessary obstacles to and disproportionate deductions for taking strike action.[94] JS11 raised similar concerns and stated that changes in employment relationships contributed to the poor wage growth.[95] JS17 indicated that with the election of the Labour-led Coalition Government, the Government had introduced legislation to overturn the majority of the regressive measures with respect to the right to collectively bargain and some of the measures with respect to the right to strike.[96]

51. JS11 indicated that there was a need for continual lifting of the minimum wage [97] and recommended the implementation of living wage mechanisms and progressing pay equity claims and settlements to achieve greater income equality.[98]

52. JS11 stated that Māori faced glaring inequality in the labour market and workforce. One reported factor in this inequality was that of the working Māori population, one third had no qualifications and over half were employed in lower-skilled jobs.[99] JS17 recalled concerns that Māori education and health workers employed by Māori and iwi (tribal) organisations received unequal pay for work of equal value as a result of discriminatory government funding arrangements.[100]

53. DPA stated that disabled people were overrepresented in unemployment figures, with latest figures showing disabled people were almost twice as likely to be unemployed as non-disabled people.[101] IMM recommended that the Government continue to collect disaggregated data relating to disability and employment and adopt meaningful strategies and programmes to address poor employment outcomes for disabled people.[102]

54. JS18 stated that Minimum Wage Exemption Permits enabled employers to pay a disabled employee less than the minimum wage in certain circumstances.[103] JS11 and JS5 raised similar concerns.[104]

55. JS11 noted there was no minimum age for children in employment under age 16 and stated that because of their vulnerability and their weakened bargaining power, there was a need to ensure youth were well protected in employment relationships.[105]

56. JS5 indicated that the gender pay gap had dropped to 9% in 2017. However, it was more pronounced for Māori and Pasifika women and varied depending on age. Women remained concentrated in lower paid occupations, such as caring, teaching, administration, and retail, which continued to be undervalued and poorly remunerated.[106] JS12 strongly encouraged the drafting and implementation of Pay Equity Legislation.[107]

Right to social security[108]

57. JS11 stated that benefit levels were inadequate to provide a reasonable standard of living and participation in society[109] and recommended that these be increased to a level sufficient to ensure people do not live in poverty.[110]

58. JS17 reported that in 2012-2013, the Government had significantly reformed the social security system and introduced sanctions for non-compliance with new punitive requirements to access welfare.[111] JS17 supported the announcement of the newly elected Labour Government to remove excessive sanctions but had been disappointed with the limited actions taken to achieve this outcome.[112]

59. JS17 noted that migrants on temporary visas or permits were ineligible for social security benefits. This included temporary migrant workers and their families.[113]

Right to an adequate standard of living[114]

60. OCC indicated that while New Zealand had generally done well in enabling economic and social participation of its people, income inequality and poverty had increased.[115]

61. About five submissions raised the issue of child poverty.[116] JS11 indicated that the pattern of generally low incomes and high levels of inequality had produced high rates of child poverty.[117] OCC reported that the number of children who experienced poverty and material deprivation remained persistently high. The latest data revealed that 27% of all children and young people lived in households with low incomes and 7% of children lived in severe poverty.[118] JS7 raised similar concerns.[119]

62. JS15 indicated that children with disabilities and Māori and Pasifika children were disproportionately over-represented in low-income households. Households with disabled children were 43% more likely to experience income poverty. Food security concerns were most frequently experienced by Pasifika and Māori young people.[120] IMM recommended that the Government collect data that would assist in the identification of the root causes of over-representation of disabled Māori and Pasifika in poor socio-economic outcomes and support the targeted delivery of programs and initiatives aimed at addressing those disparities.[121]

63. JS11 stated that the Child Reduction Poverty Bill contained an agreed suite of measures, and a regular system for measuring and reporting on child poverty.[122] OCC recommended prioritising the enactment of legislation to reduce child poverty and advance child wellbeing, aligned with CRC, the Treaty of Waitangi, and the SDGs.[123]

64. JS13 stated that the principal barrier to the right to quality housing was the high price of housing and rents compared to wages and noted reports that New Zealand had one of the widest gaps between prices and incomes.[124] OCC recommended that New Zealand develop and implement a national housing strategy that prioritised the rights of children and was linked to SDG target 11.1.[125]

65. RWNZ indicated that inaccessibility of rural communities to the same resources as urban counterparts, as well as geographic isolation, were reoccurring issues in relation to: action on violence against women, migrant workers, victim support services, rural health, economic equality, rights for disabled persons, and issues related to the older generation.126 JS3 raised related concerns regarding Southland noting the centralisation of social services had caused disenfranchisement of many country folk, particularly in areas of health education and housing.[127]

66. JS13 recommended that New Zealand address, as a matter of urgency, issues concerning the availability, affordability, quality and safety of water and due recognition of Māori water rights.[128]

67. JS15 reported that 2016 outbreak of gastroenteritis from drinking water in Havelock North affected 5,500 of the 14,000 residents raising serious concerns about drinking water safety.[129]

Right to health[130]

68. JS15 reported that between 2002 and 2016, there were 1,758 deaths due to suicide, making it the leading cause of death in adolescents and recommended that New Zealand prioritise efforts to address and prevent youth suicide.[131] OCC noted that suicide rate of Māori young people was 2.8 times higher than that of non-Māori youth.[132] JS5 stated suicide rates among the LGBTI+ population was significantly higher than the broader population and yet the Government's draft strategy to prevent suicide did not specifically address risk factors for this population.[133]

69. JS18 stated that significant gaps remained in health outcomes, with Māori and Pasifika communities, persons with disabilities and socio-economically disadvantaged groups generally experiencing worse health outcome. than other groups.[134]

70. DPA highlighted that disabled people faced barriers to accessing adequate healthcare, mental health support and sexual or family violence services. These barriers included lack of access to appropriate information in accessible formats.[135]

71. JS4 noted that men had worse health outcomes than women and indicated that while men tended to exhibit unhealthier behaviours and take up riskier occupations, these were factors that should be addressed as they were with other health inequities.[136]

72. JS16 recommended that the Government develop standards to improve access to, and the competency of health services delivered for Rainbow communities.[137]

73. ITANZ recommended that New Zealand immediately stop all non-consensual procedures which are not necessary for the preservation of life on intersex children.[138]

74. JS8 stated that there was a fragmented approach to sexuality education by the Government.[139] JS8 noted that high adolescent birth rate and that rates of sexually transmitted infections were high among young people and Māori. 140 JS8 recommended that New Zealand develop a strategic and integrated approach to sexuality and relationships education at the national level.[141]

75. JS5 stated that abortion should be decriminalised and as available as any other recognised health service.[142] JS12 made a similar recommendation.[143]

76. ADF International was concerned with the "End of Life Choice Bill", which had passed its first hearing in 2017.[144]

Right to education[145]

77. JS15 indicated that rates of bullying were high compared with other countries. Each school had its own processes for responding to bullying, which allowed for responses suited to particular school communities but could also result in inconsistency.[146] JS16 recommended that New Zealand develop comprehensive anti-bullying policies to address bullying based on someone's sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression or sex characteristics.[147]

78. DPA stated that despite an enforceable right to education many disabled people still found it difficult or impossible to access compulsory education.[148] This had implications for their ability to access higher education or meaningful employment.[149]

79. JS18 recommended that New Zealand commit to reviewing without delay all education legislative and policy settings to ensure that schools provided accessible inclusive education for all students.[150]

80. JS4 stated that boys and men were behind at all levels of education. Historically, boys had an advantage in education; however girls started performing better than boys as early as 1985.[151]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[152]

81. JS5 noted that women's leadership participation in the private sector had made very modest gains and the low percentage of female directors of the top 100 companies by market capitalisation listed on the New Zealand Stock Exchange.[153]

82. Regarding recommendations related to combatting violence against women[154], AI acknowledged a number of initiatives at the policy, institutional and legislative levels, including the reform of domestic violence legislation in 2017.[155] JS5 indicated that violence against women remained a major concern and noted that responding to family violence accounted for 41 percent of police time.[156] Māori women were over-represented in domestic violence statistics.[157] Sexual violence remained chronically under-reported with only an estimated 9% of incidents of sexual abuse reported to police, and conviction rates low.[158] JS12 also noted that disabled women are up to three times more likely to be victims of sexual and physical abuse.[159] AI noted that as of 2018 it was difficult to paint an accurate and up-to-date picture of gender-based violence due to a variety of factors, including lack of data, significant under-reporting, and changes to how police collected data.[160]

83. JS9 recommended that New Zealand commit to funding plans for the specialist violence sector (domestic and sexual violence) that were sufficient to provide all existing services without the use of volunteers.[161] AI recommended that New Zealand develop a cross-party strategy on family and sexual violence to be adhered to by all political parties and implemented by successive governments.[162]

84. JS5 stated that more needed to be done to support women from ethnic and migrant communities against practices such as forced marriage, female genital mutilation and honour-based violence.[163]

Children[164]

85. JS15 indicated that since 2013, there had been increased focus on children, particularly those considered at risk of abuse, offending or in poverty.[165] Inequalities and discrimination remained significant issues, particularly for Māori children, Pasifika children and children with disabilities.[166] JS15 recommended that New Zealand ensure the Child Wellbeing Strategy was based on children's rights and Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi), and developed in close cooperation with children, their whānau, hapu and iwi, families and communities.[167]

86. JS15 stated that a high and increasing number of children were deprived of care in their own family. It noted that a disproportionate number were Māori, highlighting that more than half of the babies taken from their mothers in 2017 were Māori.[168] JS15 recommended that New Zealand provide effective and culturally-appropriate support services to families, in particular whānau Māori.[169] JS9 recommended that New Zealand reduce the number of tamariki Māori (Maori children) taken into state care by supporting whānau (family) earlier.[170]

87. JS15 noted that the Historical Abuse in State Care Royal Commission excluded abuse within religious institutions, unless the State had transferred responsibility of children to the religious institution, and that children currently in State care needed immediate protection.[171] CL was concerned that the timeframe of the Inquiry, which only covered abuse suffered by those in care between 1 January 1950 and 31 December 1999 was arbitrary.[172]

88. JS15 recommended that New Zealand begin to eradicate the use of violence and abuse in State care immediately, including the use of restraints and detention[173]; and ensure that every child in State care can make complaints which are addressed.[174]

89. JS7 was concerned that there continued to be a lack of a comprehensive system for collecting disaggregated data on areas covered by the OP-CRC-SC, in particular the sale of children and exploitation of children in prostitution. This seriously hindered the possibility to adopt effective strategies and the ability to monitor them.[175]

Persons with disabilities[176]

90. JS18 recalled that New Zealand had accepted 7 recommendations relating to disabilities during the previous UPR and had committed to 17 actions to address them.[177] JS18 indicated while there had been progress with gathering disability related data, gaps remained.[178] IMM stated that gaps occurred across all priority issues for disabled people and were compounded by the lack of a commonly accepted definition of 'disability' by public and private interests.[179]

91. DPA stated that the Disabled Persons Community Welfare Act 1975 had largely been repealed over time, leading to inconsistent standards of accessibility.[180] JS18 indicated that disabled people continued to report major areas of continued non-accessibility and uneven compliance with voluntary accessibility standards.[181]

92. DPA stated that it was urgent that the Government commit to working with people with learning disabilities and their representative organisations to move towards the implementation of Supported Decision making practices and away from the practice of Welfare Guardianship.[182]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[183]

93. AIMM indicated that there was still no overarching plan or strategy for the implementation of the UNDRIP, which meant that there were major gaps in relation to the key rights of self-determination and participation.[184]

94. AirTrust noted that treaty settlements policy and processes were determined wholly by the government.[185] AIMM recommended that New Zealand reach an agreement with the Māori on a fairer process for the settlement of Treaty claims that complied with international human rights standards.[186]

95. AIMM stated that for Māori, meaningful participation in decision-making was not a reality. Consultation and engagement did not reflect the obligations of Te Tiriti or the standards of the UNDRIP of free, prior and informed consent.[187]

96. WEGC noted complaints about the action of corporations and threats to and destruction of the environment.188 JS10 stated that the Exclusive Economic Zone Act breached mana whenua's (indigenous people with territorial rights) human rights, particularly on consultation and free prior and informed consent; the lack of effective impact assessments and benefit sharing. JS10 was particularly concerned regarding marine consent obtained by a company to extract iron sands from the Exclusive Economic Zone. This decision was awaiting the result of and appeal to the High Court.[189]

97. SSIGGNZ raised the issue of denial of citizenship of persons from Samoa born between 1924 and 1948 under the Citizenship (Western Samoa) Act 1982.[190]

Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers[191]

98. JS17 reported on continued concerns with exploitation of migrant workers. The Government had signalled its support for action to eliminate labour exploitation, including by increasing resources and staffing for the Labour Inspectorate. However, further action was needed, including reviewing immigration policies and regulations to remove barriers for migrant workers reporting abuses of their rights.[192]

99. JS16 recommended amending the Immigration Act 2009, to extend the mandate of the Human Rights Commission so that it could receive complaints of human rights violations related to immigration laws, policies and practices.[193]

100. JS13 stated that the Immigration (Mass Arrivals) Amendment Act 2013 made radical changes in the name of "enhancing New Zealand's ability to deter people-smuggling to New Zealand. The Act established a definition of 'mass arrival group of 30 people' and imposed upon this group mandatory detention, a restriction on judicial review and a limitation on family reunification rights.[194] NZLS stated that it considered the Act to be inconsistent with the Bill of Rights.[195]

101. AI remained concerned about breaches of the rights of persons seeking asylum, including the detention of some asylum-seekers alongside the wider remand detainee population, their security and well-being, and the length of time in detention.[196]

102. JS13 stated that in 2013 New Zealand made and arrangement with a third country whereby it would resettle 150 refugees per year but that the arrangement denied asylum seekers the right to claim protection in the country.[197]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org: (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status).

Civil society

Individual submissions:

AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom;
AccessNow	Access Now, New York, United States of America;
ADF International	ADF International, Geneva, Switzerland;
AIR Trust	Aotearoa Indigenous Rights Trust, Gisborne, New Zealand;
AIMM	Aotearoa Independent Monitoring Mechanism, Auckland, New Zealand;
CGNK	Center for Global Nonkilling, Honolulu, United States of America;

Chief Ombudsman	Chief Ombudsman New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand;
CL	Cooper Legal, Wellington, New Zealand;
DPA	Disabled Persons Assembly NZ, Wellington, New Zealand;
EC	Empowered Christchurch Incorporated,Christchurch, New Zealand;
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva, Switzerland;
IMM	Independent Monitoring Mechanism under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Wellington, New Zealand;
ITANZ	Intersex Trust of New Zealand, Wairarapa, New Zealand;
JCNZ	Just Community, Auckland, New Zealand;
NZARH	New Zealand Association of Rationalists and Humanists, Auckland, New Zealand;
NZLS	New Zealand Law Society, Wellington, New Zealand;
OCC	Office of the Children's Commissioner, Wellington, New Zealand;
PI	Privacy International, London, United Kingdom;
RWNZ	Rural Women New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand;
SSIGGNZ	Samoa Solidarity International Group Global New Zealand, Auckland, New Zealand;
WEGC	Waitaha Executive Grandmothers Council, Auckland, New Zealand;

Joint submissions:

JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by**: Organization for Defending Victim of Violence, Tehran, Iran (Islamic Republic of), and Pouya Institute for Communications and Social Development (PICSD);
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by**: Secular Education Network, Auckland, New Zealand, and the Humanist Society of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand;
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by**: Southland Interagency Forum Incorporated, Invercargill, New Zealand, Welcoming Newcomers, Able – Southern Family Support, Methodist Mission, Learning Differences Aotearoa, Habitat for Humanity Invercargill, Salvation Army, Family Violence Network, Programme for Assertive Community Treatment (PACT), National Council of Women Southland Branch, Number 10 Youth One Stop Shop, Access Ability Charitable Trust, Age Concern, Arts Murihiku, Autism NZ Inc Southland Branch, Balance Wellness Centre - Seventh Day Adventist, Barnardos, Cancer Society, Citizens Advice Bureau - Invercargill and District, Community Trust of Southland, Community Worker – Otautau, Community Worker – Northern Southland, Community House – Riverton, Community Worker – Takitimu, Community Worker – Tuatapere, Community Worker- Winton, CCS Disability Action, Department of Internal Affairs, Disabilities Resource Centre, English Language Partners, Family Works Southland – Presbyterian Support Southland, Fiordland Community House, Community Networking Trust (Eastern Southland), Jubilee Budget Advisory Service, McGlynn Homes, New Zealand Red Cross – Southland Branch, Nga Kete Matauranga Pounumau TRUST, Parent to Parent Southland, Pregnancy Help, Public Health South, Rape & Abuse Support Centre, South Alive, South Centre Family Support, Southern Adult Literacy, Southern REAP, Southland Community House, Southland Community Law Centre, Southland Rural Women NZ, Sport Southland, Stand for Children, Strengthening Families, Stopping Violence Southland, Venture Southland, YMCA, Youthline Southland;
JS4	**Joint submission 4 submitted by**: Support for Men in New

	Zealand Aotearoa, Christchurch, New Zealand, Canterbury Men's Centre, The Male Room, Wake Up NZ, Black Ribbon NZ, Men's and Boy's Human Rights New Zealand;
JS5	**Joint submission 5 submitted by**: Pacific Women's Watch, Auckland, New Zealand, Māori Women's Welfare League, Shakti Community Council Inc., Disabled Women;
JS6	**Joint submission 6 submitted by**: The Backbone Collective and The Auckland Coalition for the Safety of Women and Children, Auckland, New Zealand;
JS7	**Joint submission 7 submitted by**: ECPAT Internationals, Bangkok, Thailand and ECPAT Child Alert New Zealand, Auckland, New Zealand;
JS8	**Joint submission 8 submitted by**: Action Canada for Sexual Health and Rights, Ottawa, Canada, Te Whāriki Takapou, Family Planning, Sexual Rights Initiative, Geneva, Switzerland;
JS9	**Joint submission 9 submitted by**: Coalition for the Safety of Women and Children, Auckland, New Zealand; Auckland Sexual Abuse HELP, Women's Centre,Backbone Collective, Eastern Women's Refuge, Homework's Trust, Inner City Women's Group, Mental Health Foundation, Mt Albert Psychological Services, North Shore Women's Centre, Rape Prevention Education – Whakatu Mauri, SHINE Safer Homes in NZ Everyday, Supportline Women's Refuge Te Rito Women's Centre Rodney, Women's Health Action Trust;
JS10	**Joint submission 10 submitted by**: Te Runanga o Ngati Ruanui Trust, Hawera, New Zealand, Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Ruanui Trust, Ahitahi Hapū, Araukūku Hapū, Hāmua Hapū, Hāpōtiki Hapū, Ngā Ariki Hapū, Ngāti Hawe Hapū, Rangitāwhi Hapū, Tūwhakachu Hapū Ngāti Tūpaea Hapū Ngāti Hine Hapū Ngāti Kōtuku Hapū Ngāti Ringi Hapū Ngāti Tūpito Hapū Tuatahi Hapū Ngāti Tākou Hapū Ngāti Tānewai Hapū Wharepuni Marae Whakaahurangi Marae Ngātiki Marae Taiporohēnui Marae Meremere Marae Mokoia Marae Ararātā Marae Ngātiki Marae Wai o Turi Marae Meremere Marae Wharepuni Marae Meremere Marae Whenuakura Marae Pariroa Marae Manutahi Marae Ararātā Marae Wai o Turi Marae;
JS11	**Joint submission 11 submitted by**: New Zealand Council of Trade Unions, Wellington, New Zealand, Association of Salaried Medical Specialists (ASMS), Customs Officers Association of New Zealand (COA), FIRST Furniture, Manufacturing & Associated Workers Union, Independent Schools Education Association, Maritime Union of New Zealand (MUNZ), Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance (NZ Actors Equity), Merchant Service Guild, Midwifery Representation and Advisory Services (MERAS), NZ Dairy Workers Union (DWU), New Zealand Educational Institute, Te Riu Roa (NZEI), NZ Meat Workers and Related Trades Union, NZ Merchant Service - Guild Industrial Union of Workers, NZ Nurses Organisation (NZNO), NZ Post Primary Teachers Association Te Wehengarua, NZ Professional Firefighters Union (NZPFU), NZ Professional Footballers Association (NZPFA), NZ Tramways and Public Transport Employees Union, NZ Writers Guild (NZWG), Postal Workers Union of Aotearoa, Public Service Association (PSA), Rail & Maritime Transport Union (RMTU), Tertiary Education Union - Te Hautu Kahurangi o Aotearoa Takitini o Aotearoa (TEU), Tertiary Institutes Allied Staff Association (TIASA), TUIA Union UNITE;
JS12	**Joint submission 12 submitted by**: Women's Health Action Trust, Auckland, New Zealand and Mothers and Midwives

	Associated (MAMA);
JS13	**Joint submission 13 submitted by**: Human Rights Foundation of Aotearoa, Auckland, New Zealand, Action for Children and Youth Aotearoa, Asylum Seekers Support Trust, Auckland Coalition for the Safety of Women and Children (comprising Auckland Sexual Abuse HELP, Auckland Women's Centre, Eastern Women's Refuge, Homeworks Trust, Inner City Women's Group, Mental Health Foundation, Mt Albert Psychological Services, North Shore Women's Centre, Rape Prevention Education Whakatu Mauri, SHINE Safer Homes in New Zealand Everyday, Women's Health Action Trust, Women's Centre Rodney), Auckland Refugee Family Trust, Auckland Resettled Community Coalition, Auckland Regional Migrant Services, Backbone Collective, CAB Language Connect, Child Poverty Action Group, Justspeak, New Zealand Red Cross, Peace Movement Aotearoa, Wage Peace NZ.
JS14	**Joint submission 14 submitted by**: New Zealand's National Preventative Mechanisms under OPCAT Wellington (New Zealand, Independent Police Conduct Authority Children's Commissioner Ombudsman Inspector of Service Penal Establishments New Zealand Human Rights Commission.
JS15	**Joint submission 15 submitted by**: Children's Rights Coalition for UPR 3 Aotearoa Wellington (New Zealand), Action for Children and Youth Aotearoa (ACYA), Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG), Save the Children NZ IHC Barnardos CCS Disability Action Child Matters YouthLaw New Zealand Nurses Organisation Tōpūtanga Tapuhi Kaitiaki o Aotearoa (NZNO) NZEI Te Riu Roa OMEP Aotearoa New Zealand Peace Movement Aotearoa The Public Health Association of New Zealand Royal New Zealand Plunket Trust Safeguarding Children Tiakina ngā tamariki Stand Children's Services Tu Maia Whanau UNICEF New Zealand University of Otago Children's Issues Centre Wesley Community Action;
JS16	**Joint submission 16 submitted by**: Aotearoa New Zealand IDAHOBIT Day Coalition, Gisborne, New Zealand, InsideOUT, Intersex Trust Aotearoa New Zealand (ITANZ), Tīwhanawhana Trust, Adolescent Health Research Group, University of Auckland, Ara Taiohi, Counting Ourselves Research Team, University of Waikato, F'INE, Love Life Fono, Matariki Services Ltd, Mental Health Foundation, New Zealand AIDS Foundation (NZAF), Ngā Whiitiki Whānau Āhuru Mōwai o Aotearoa, Outerspaces, OUTLine, Qtopia, Q Youth, RainbowYOUTH, Rape Crisis Dunedin, re frame, Silver Rainbow, Skylight Trust, The UpRising Charitable Trust, WaQuY (Waikato Queer Youth),
JS17	**Joint submission 17 submitted by**: International Centre for Trade Union Rights, London, United Kingdom; The New Zealand Council of Trade Unions *Te Kauae Kaimahi*, Wellington, New Zealand;
JS18	**Joint submission 18 submitted by**: Joint Submission on Disability Issues, Wellington, New Zealand, Kapo Māori Aotearoa, the Blind Foundation, IHC Advocacy, CCS Disability Action, Coromandel Independent Living Trust, The Supported Life Style Hauraki Trust, Progress to Health, Inclusive NZ, Home and Community Health Association, Inclusive Education Advisory Group, and Parents of Vision Impaired New Zealanders.
National human rights institution:	
NZHRC	New Zealand Human Rights Commission, Wellington, New Zealand.

[2] NZHRC, para.5.
[3] NZHRC, para.1.
[4] NZHRC, para.8.
[5] NZHRC, para.11.
[6] NZHRC, para.8.
[7] NZHRC, para.9.
[8] NZHRC, para.12.
[9] NZHRC, para.16.
[10] NZHRC, para.17.
[11] NZHRC, para.20.
[12] NZHRC, para.22.
[13] UPR Recommendation 106 (Romania), 108 (Switzerland), 109 (United Kingdom), 110 (Chile), 111 (Republic of Congo), 112 (Germany), 114 (Italy) 115 (Namibia), 116 (Greece), 117 (Cyprus), 118 (Slovakia), 119 (Spain), 120 (Czech Republic), 121 (Australia), 122 (Botswana), 123 (Palestine), 127 (Hungary), 130 (Paraguay).
[14] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paragraph 128.107 (France).
[15] NZHRC, para.24.
[16] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paragraphs 128.92 (Australia), 128.96 (France), 128. 97 (Malaysia), 128.98 (Iraq).
[17] NZHRC, para.26.
[18] NZHRC, para.28.
[19] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paragraphs 128.55 (Ukraine), 128.56 (Indonesia), 128.57 (Australia), 128.58 (Cape Verde), 128.59 (Canada), 128.60 (Chile), 128.61 (Malaysia).
[20] NZHRC, paras.29-30.
[21] NZHRC, paras. 33-34.
[22] NZHRC, para. 35.
[23] NZHRC, para. 39.
[24] NZHRC, para. 44.
[25] NZHRC, paras. 45-46.
[26] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR;
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

[27] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/26/3, paras.128.1-128.28, 128.46-128.47, 128.101-128.102, 128.104, 128.146.
[28] JS1, para.12, JS11, para.7.8.2, JS13, para.4.
[29] JS17, p.9.
[30] JS11, para. 7.8.2.

[31] ICAN, p.1.
[32] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.27-128.36, 128.42-128.47.
[33] JS13, para.5.
[34] JS13, para.7.
[35] NZLS para.3.
[36] NZLS, para.6.
[37] NZLS, para.8.
[38] AirTrust, p.1. See also AIMM, paras.6-8, p.3.
[39] JS13, paras.12-14.
[40] JS13, paras. 20-21.
[41] JS14, para.6.
[42] JS14, p.3.
[43] CGNK, p.4.
[44] AI, p.1.
[45] JS13, para.24.
[46] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/26/3, paras. paras. 128.62, 128.68–128.81 and 128.147–128.151.
[47] JS9, p.7.
[48] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.48-128.53.
[49] EC, p.1.
[50] EC, p.3.
[51] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.155.
[52] JS13, para. 48.
[53] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.82-128.84, 128.132.
[54] AI, p.6.
[55] JS14, para.23.
[56] Chief Ombudsman, para.5.
[57] JS14, para.31-32. See also AI, p.6, JS13, para.33.
[58] CL, para.31.
[59] Chief Ombudsman, para.9.
[60] Chief Ombudsman, para.15.
[61] AI, p.8. See also IMM paras. 22-27.
[62] JS14, para.33.
[63] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.56, 128.64, 128.81-128.84, 128.133.
[64] CL, para. 25.
[65] DPA, p.6.
[66] JS5, para.33. See also JS9, p. 4, JS13, para.68.
[67] JS4, para.51.See also, JS13, para. 69.
[68] JS6, para.11.
[69] AI, pp. 5-6, AirTrust, pp.1-2, JCNZ, pp.1-2, JS5, paras. 31-34, JS9, p.4, JS13, paras. 36-37, JS14, paras. 17-22.
[70] AI, p. 5. See also JS14, para.17.
[71] AirTrust, p.1.
[72] JS5, para.31.
[73] JS13, para.37. See also AI, p.8.
[74] JS14 p.5.
[75] JCNZ, p.1.
[76] AI p.6.
[77] JS15, p.8.
[78] AI p.6. JS13, para.28, JS14, para.29.JS15, p.8.
[79] JS14, para.25.
[80] JS14, para.26.
[81] AI, p.8.
[82] JS15, p.9. See also JS13. para.29.
[83] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.145.
[84] NZAHR, p.4.
[85] JS2, para.71.
[86] JS13, paras. 30 and 32.
[87] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.34, 128.154.
[88] PI, para.5.
[89] PI, paras.6, 9 and 11.
[90] AccessNow para. 12.

[91] PI, paras. 12 and 29.
[92] AccessNow para. 19.
[93] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.36, 128.39, 128.69, 128.95-128.99.
[94] JS17, p. 4.
[95] JS11, paras. 2.1, 2.4-2.5.
[96] JS17, p. 6. See also JS11, para.2.3.
[97] JS11, para. 4.6.
[98] JS11, para. 4.8.2.
[99] JS11, para.5.2.
[100] JS17, p. 7.
[101] DPA, p.5. See also IMM paras. 17-21.
[102] IMM p.6.
[103] JS18, p.10.
[104] JS11, paras. 6.1 and .6.6.1 and J35 paras. 9 and 11.
[105] JS11, paras. 7.1, 7.5-7.6.
[106] JS5, para.8.
[107] JS12, p. 5.
[108] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.61, 128.138.
[109] JS11, para. 5.6.
[110] JS11, 5.8.2.
[111] JS17, p.8.See also JS15, p.12.
[112] JS17, p.9.
[113] JS17, p.9.
[114] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.51-128.53, 128.55, 128.57-128.63, 128.66128.67, 128.70, 128, 135.
[115] OCC, para.2.
[116] S7, paras.5, 22 and p. 7, JS11, paras. 11.1-11.4, JS13, paras. 72-73, 82-83, JS15, p.13, OCC, paras.16-18.
[117] JS11, para5.1.
[118] OCC, para.16.
[119] JS7, para.5.
[120] JS15, p.13. See also IMM, para.5, OCC, para.17.
[121] IMM, p.3.
[122] JS11, para. 11.4.1. See also OCC, para.18.
[123] OCC, p.5. See also JS13, para. 81.
[124] JS13, paras. 82-83. See also OCC, para.19. JS15, p.13.
[125] OCC, p.5.
[126] RWNZ, p.1.
[127] JS3, p.1.
[128] JS13, para. 94.
[129] JS15, p.13.
[130] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.64, 128.69, 128.136-128.137.
[131] JS15, p.7.
[132] OCC, para. 25.
[133] JS5, para.36.
[134] JS18, p.11. See also JS15, p.14, OCC, paras. 23-24.
[135] DPA, p.7.
[136] JS4, para.32.
[137] JS16, para.12.
[138] ITANZ, p.4. See also JS16, para.25.
[139] JS8, para. 11.
[140] JS8, paras. 13 and 15.
[141] JS8, para. 36.
[142] JS5, para.38.
[143] JS12, pp.8-9.
[144] ADF International, para.12.
[145] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.36, 128.64, 128.69, 128.139-128.141, 128.143.
[146] JS15, p.7. See also JS7, para. 22, JS16, paras. 27-28.
[147] JS16, para. 32. See also JS5, para.23.
[148] DPA, p.4. See also JS18, p.11, IMM, p.5.
[149] DPA, p.5.

[150] JS18, p.11.
[151] JS3, para.22.
[152] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.39, 128.69-128.70, 128.91-128.99, 128.-106-128.112, 128.114-128.122, 128.125-128.127, 128.129-128.130.
[153] JS5, para.14. See also JS12, paras. 3.2.2-3.2.3.
[154] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paragraphs 128.95 (Ireland), 128.106 (Romania), 128.107, (France), 128.108 (Switzerland), 128.109 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 128.110 (Chile), 128.111 (Congo), 128.112 (Germany), 128.114 (Italy), 128.115 (Namibia), 128.116 (Greece), 128.117 (Cyprus), 128.118 (Slovakia), 128.119 (Spain), 128.120 (Czech Republic), 128.121(Australia), 128.122 (Botswana), 128.125 (Republic of Moldova), 128.126 (Iran), 128.127 (Hungary), 128.129 (Italy), 128.130 (Paraguay).
[155] AI, pp.1-2.
[156] JS5, para.21.See also JS9, p.8.
[157] JS5, para.22.
[158] JS5, para.26.
[159] JS12, para.2.1.6.
[160] AI, p.4.
[161] JS9, p.2.
[162] AI, p.8. See also JS13, para.67.
[163] JS5, para.28.
[164] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.44, 128.54-128.64, 128.66-128.67, 128.69-128.70, 128.106-128.109, 128.111-128.115, 128.122-128.124, 128.128-128-130, 128.138, 128.143.
[165] JS 15, p. 3.
[166] JS15, p.4.
[167] JS15, p.4
[168] JS15, p.10.
[169] JS15, p.11.
[170] JS9, p. 2.
[171] JS15. P.7.
[172] CL, para.20.
[173] JS15, p.8.
[174] JS15, p.11.
[175] JS7,para.12.
[176] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.52, 128.67, 128.95, 128.105, 128.150
[177] JS18, p.3.
[178] JS18, p.5.
[179] IMM, para.7.
[180] DPA, p.5.
[181] JS18, p.7.
[182] DPA, p.5.
[183] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.36-128.38, 128.63-128.67, 128.69, 128.73-128.90, 128.95, 128.101, 128.126-128-127, 128.137, 128.143-128.144.
[184] AIMM, para.31.
[185] AirTrust, p.1.
[186] AIMM, p.8.
[187] AIMM, para.13.
[188] WEGC, p.4.
[189] JS10, pp.2-3. See also AIMM, paras. 19-20.
[190] SSIGGNZ, p.5.
[191] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/3, paras. 128.69, 128.101 and 128.146–128.153.
[192] JS17, p.8.
[193] JS16, paras. 48-49.
[194] JS13, para. 49.
[195] NZLS, para. 25.
[196] AI, p.4. See also JS13, para. 52.
[197] JS13, paras. 63-64.